arXiv:1203.2871v1 [math.PR] 13 Mar 2012

On Bobkov's approximate de Finetti representation via approximation of permanents of complex rectangular matrices

Bero Roos*

University of Trier

February 26, 2013

Abstract

Bobkov (2005) investigated an approximate de Finetti representation for probability measures on product measurable spaces, which are symmetric under permutations of coordinates. One of the main results of that paper was an explicit approximation bound for permanents of complex rectangular matrices, which was shown by a complicated induction argument. In this paper, we indicate how to avoid the induction argument using an (asymptotic) expansion. Our approach makes it possible to give new explicit higher order approximation bounds for such permanents and in turn for the probability measures mentioned above.

Keywords: de Finetti representation, permanent, inequality.

AMS subject classifications: 60G09, 62E17, 15A45.

1 Introduction

Suppose that $X := (X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots)$ is an infinite exchangeable sequence of random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ with values in a measurable space $(S, \mathcal{S})$, that is, the distribution P^X of X on the infinite product measurable space $(S^\infty, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes\infty})$ is invariant under permutations of a finite number of coordinates. The de Finetti Theorem says that, under mild assumptions on the space $(S, \mathcal{S})$, there is a probability space $(T, \mathcal{T}, \nu)$ and a Markov kernel $\mu : T \times \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow [0,1]$, $(t, A) \mapsto \mu_t(A)$ such that

$$P^X = \int_T (\mu_t)^{\otimes\infty} \,\mathrm{d}\nu(t).$$

For instance, it suffices to assume that $(S, \mathcal{S})$ is a Borel (or standard) measurable space, i.e. Borel isomorphic to some Borel measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ (see Hewitt and Savage (1955) or Diaconis and Freedman (1980)).

For a finite exchangeable sequence, an analogous representation does not generally hold, but there are approximate de Finetti results. In what follows, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \underline{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$, and let $Y_N = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ be an exchangeable family of S-valued random variables, that is, the distribution P^{Y_N} of Y_N, defined on $(S^N, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes N})$ is invariant under permutation of coordinates. Let Q_1 be the probability measure on $(S^n, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$ defined by

$$Q_1(A) = \int \Big(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} I_{X_j(\omega)}\Big)^{\otimes n}(A) \,\mathrm{d}P(\omega)$$

---

[*] Postal address: FB 4 – Dept. of Mathematics, University of Trier, 54286 Trier, Germany. E-mail: `bero.roos@uni-trier.de`

for $A \in \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}$, where I_x denotes the Dirac measure at point $x \in S$. The following results can be found in Diaconis and Freedman (1980). They showed that

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(P^{Y_n}, Q_1) \leq 1 - \frac{N!}{(N-n)!N^n} \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2N}, \tag{1}$$

where $d_{\mathrm{TV}}(R, R') = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}} |R(A) - R'(A)|$ denotes the total variation distance between finite signed measures R and R' on $(S^n, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$. Hence, if $\frac{n^2}{N}$ is small then P^{Y_n} has an approximate de Finetti representation Q_1. It turned out that, in general, the bound (1) is sharp. However, if S is finite and of cardinality $|S| := d \in \mathbb{N}$, then another nice bound is available:

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}(P^{Y_n}, Q_1) \leq \frac{dn}{N}. \tag{2}$$

Therefore, in the case of finite S, (2) is better than (1), if d is sufficiently smaller than n.

On the other hand, it is possible to obtain similar good bounds in the general case if the total variation distance is replaced by a weaker probability metric. Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the set of all functions $f : S^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that measurable $f_1, \ldots, f_n : S \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ exist with $|f_k(x_k)| \leq 1$ for $k \in \underline{n}$ and $f(x) = \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(x_k)$ for all $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in S^n$. We write $f = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n f_k$. Furthermore, let $\underline{N}^n_{\neq} = \{(j_1, \ldots, j_n) \in \underline{N}^n \,|\, j_k \neq j_\ell \text{ for all } k, \ell \in \underline{n} \text{ with } k \neq \ell\}$.

Bobkov (2005) showed in his Theorem 1.1 (see also p. 405 there) the inequality

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \Big| \int f \,\mathrm{d}P^{Y_n} - \int f \,\mathrm{d}Q_1 \Big| \leq 16 \frac{n}{N}. \tag{3}$$

For the proof, he used the representation

$$\begin{aligned}\int f \,\mathrm{d}P^{Y_n} - \int f \,\mathrm{d}Q_1 &= \int \Big(\prod_{k=1}^n f_k(X_k(\omega)) - \int f \,\mathrm{d}\Big(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N I_{X_j(\omega)} \Big)^{\otimes n} \Big) \,\mathrm{d}P(\omega) \\ &= \int \Big(\frac{(N-n)!}{N!} \sum_{j \in \underline{N}^n_{\neq}} \prod_{k=1}^n f_k(X_{j_k}(\omega)) - \prod_{k=1}^n \Big(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_k(X_j(\omega)) \Big) \Big) \,\mathrm{d}P(\omega)\end{aligned}$$

for $f = \bigotimes_{k=1}^n f_k \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and a remarkable approximation result for permanents of complex rectangular matrices (see Theorem A below), which he proved by using a somewhat complicated induction argument. The permanent of a complex rectangular matrix $Z = (z_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times n}$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \underline{N}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Per}(Z) := \sum_{j \in \underline{N}^n_{\neq}} \prod_{k=1}^n z_{j_k,k}.$$

For general properties of permanents, we refer the reader to Minc (1978) and Cheon and Wanless (2005).

Theorem A. (Bobkov, 2005) *Let* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \underline{N}$ *and* $Z = (z_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times n}$. *For* $j \in \underline{N}$ *and* $k \in \underline{n}$, *we assume that* $|z_{j,k}| \leq 1$ *and set* $\widetilde{z}_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N z_{j,k}$. *Then*

$$\Big| \frac{(N-n)!}{N!} \mathrm{Per}(Z) - \prod_{k=1}^n \widetilde{z}_k \Big| \leq C \frac{n}{N} \tag{4}$$

with the constant $C = 16$.

We note that Theorem 2.2 below shows that the constant in (4) can be made smaller. Furthermore, from Proposition 4.1 in Bobkov (2004) it follows that (4) holds with the better constant $C = 6$, if $z_{j,k} = z_{j,1}$ for all $j \in \underline{N}$ and $k \in \underline{n}$.

For two finite signed measures R and R' on $(S^n, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$, let

$$d_{\mathrm{PV}}(R, R') = \sup_{A_1,\dots,A_n\in\mathcal{S}} |R(A_1 \times \dots \times A_n) - R'(A_1 \times \dots \times A_n)|$$

denote the so-called product variation between R and R'. Obviously d_{PV} is a metric on the set of all finite signed measures on $(S^n, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$. Furthermore,

$$d_{\mathrm{PV}}(R, R') \leq \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_n} \Big| \int f \,\mathrm{d}(R - R')\Big|.$$

Therefore (3) and the inequalities of Theorem 1.1 imply bounds for d_{PV}.

In the next section, we present refinements of (4), see Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and Corollary 2.1. The latter implies a result which is better than (3) if $\frac{n}{N}$ is sufficiently small. Further, if $n \geq 2$ and in turn $N \geq 2$, an approximation of P^{Y_n} by a finite signed measure Q_2 on $(S^n, \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$ is possible, where

$$Q_2(A) = Q_1(A) - \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}\colon |K|=2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int \Big(\bigotimes_{k\in\underline{n}} R_{j,k,K}(\omega)\Big)(A)\,\mathrm{d}P(\omega)$$

for $A \in \mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}$ and

$$R_{j,k,K}(\omega) = \begin{cases} I_{X_j(\omega)} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N} I_{X_\ell(\omega)}, & \text{if } k \in K \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N} I_{X_\ell(\omega)}, & \text{if } k \in \underline{n} \setminus K. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.1 *Under the assumptions above and if* $\frac{n}{N} < \mathrm{e}^{-2}$, *we have*

$$\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_n} \Big|\int f\,\mathrm{d}P^{Y_n} - \int f\,\mathrm{d}Q_1\Big| \leq \frac{n}{N} + 9.51\,\frac{(\frac{n}{N})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-\mathrm{e}^2\frac{n}{N}}},$$

$$\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_n} \Big|\int f\,\mathrm{d}P^{Y_n} - \int f\,\mathrm{d}Q_2\Big| \leq \sqrt{3}\Big(\frac{n}{N}\Big)^{3/2} + 24.14\,\frac{(\frac{n}{N})^{2}}{\sqrt{1-\mathrm{e}^2\frac{n}{N}}}, \qquad \textit{if } n \geq 2.$$

Higher order results are also possible using Theorem 2.1 below. We omit the details.

2 Approximation of permanents

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the indeterminate $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}^n$, we set $x^r = \prod_{k\in\underline{n}} x_k^{r_k}$ and write $a_r = \mathrm{Coeff}(x^r; \sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}_+^n} a_s x^s)$ for the coefficient of x^r in $\sum_{s\in\mathbb{Z}_+^n} a_s x^s$, ($a_s \in \mathbb{C}$). Sometimes y will be our indeterminate. In what follows, we use the simple fact that, for $Z = (z_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times n}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \underline{N}$,

$$\mathrm{Per}(Z) = \mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1 \cdots x_n; \prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} z_{j,k} x_k\Big)\Big). \tag{5}$$

The main result of this section is Theorem 2.1 below and requires the following four lemmas, the first of which can be shown in the same way as the more complicated Lemma 3 in Roos (2001). For the sake of completeness, we include a proof here. We always set $0^0 = 1$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \underline{N}$ *and* $A = (a_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times n}$. *For each* $k \in \underline{n}$, *we assume that* $\sum_{j=1}^N a_{j,k} = 0$ *and set* $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N |a_{j,k}|^2$. *Then we have*

$$|\mathrm{Per}(A)| \leq \frac{n^{n/2}\,N^{N/2}}{(N-n)^{(N-n)/2}}\prod_{k=1}^n \sqrt{\alpha_k}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. We may assume that $\alpha_k \neq 0$ for every $k \in \underline{n}$. Using (5), we obtain for arbitrary $R_1, \dots, R_n \in (0,\infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathrm{Per}(A)| &= \frac{1}{R_1\cdots R_n}\Big|\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\cdots\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}(t_1+\ldots+t_n)}}{(2\pi)^n}\prod_{j=1}^N\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^n a_{j,k}R_k\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t_k}\Big)\mathrm{d}t_1\ldots\mathrm{d}t_n\Big|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{R_1\cdots R_n}\sup_{t_1,\dots,t_n\in[-\pi,\pi]}\prod_{j=1}^N\Big|1+\sum_{k=1}^n a_{j,k}R_k\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t_k}\Big|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{R_1\cdots R_n}\Big(1+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N\Big(\sum_{k=1}^n|a_{j,k}|R_k\Big)^2\Big)^{N/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The last inequality follows from the inequality between arithmetic and geometric means. Indeed, for $w_1, \dots, w_N \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\sum_{j=1}^N w_j = 0$, we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^N|1+w_j| = \Big(\prod_{j=1}^N(1+2\mathrm{Re}(w_j)+|w_j|^2)\Big)^{1/2} \leq \Big(1+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N|w_j|^2\Big)^{N/2},$$

where $\mathrm{Re}(w_j)$ denotes the real part of w_j. Cauchy's inequality now gives

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N\Big(\sum_{k=1}^n|a_{j,k}|R_k\Big)^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k_1=1}^n\sum_{k_2=1}^n R_{k_1}R_{k_2}\sum_{j=1}^N|a_{j,k_1}a_{j,k_2}| \leq \Big(\sum_{k=1}^n R_k\sqrt{\alpha_k}\Big)^2. \tag{8}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$ and $R_k = (n(N-n+\varepsilon)\alpha_k)^{-1/2}$ for $k \in \underline{n}$. Combining (7) and (8) and letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, the result is shown. □

Remark 2.1 Inequality (6) can be viewed as a Hadamard type inequality for permanents of matrices with zero column sums. A comparable result is due to Carlen *et al.* (2006). They proved the remarkable inequality

$$|\mathrm{Per}(Z)| \leq N!\prod_{k=1}^N\Big(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N|z_{j,k}|^2\Big)^{1/2},$$

which is valid for general quadratic matrices $Z = (z_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. This inequality can be used to derive an alternative bound for the left-hand side of (6) as follows. Consider the assumptions of Lemma 2.1 and define $Z = (z_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ with $z_{j,k} = a_{j,k}$ for $j \in \underline{N}$, $k \in \underline{n}$ and $z_{j,k} = 1$ for $j \in \underline{N}$, $k \in \underline{N}\setminus\underline{n}$. Then

$$|\mathrm{Per}(A)| = \frac{|\mathrm{Per}(Z)|}{(N-n)!} \leq \frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\prod_{k=1}^n\sqrt{\alpha_k}. \tag{9}$$

Let us compare (6) with (9). From Lemma 2.2 below it follows that

$$\frac{n^{n/2}N^{N/2}}{(N-n)^{(N-n)/2}}\leq\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{e}}}\frac{\mathrm{e}^n}{\sqrt{\binom{N}{n}}}\frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\leq\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{e}}}\Big(\frac{n\mathrm{e}^2}{N}\Big)^{n/2}\frac{N!}{(N-n)!}.$$

This implies that (6) is much better than the inequality in (9) if $\frac{n}{N}$ is sufficiently small. Therefore, in this paper we prefer (6) to (9).

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\ell, m, N\in\mathbb{N}$, $\ell\leq m\leq N$ and $C_\ell=\big(\frac{\ell^\ell}{\mathrm{e}^\ell\ell!}\big)^{1/2}$. Then*

$$\frac{m^{m/2}}{\mathrm{e}^m m!}\cdot\frac{N^{N/2}}{(N-m)^{(N-m)/2}\binom{N}{m}^{1/2}}\leq C_\ell. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Let $p(m,N)=\frac{N^N}{(N-m)^{N-m}\binom{N}{m}}$. Since $q(k):=(\frac{k}{k+1})^k$ is decreasing in $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, we have

$$\frac{p(m,N)}{p(m,N+1)}=\frac{N^N(N+1-m)^{N+1-m}(N+1)}{(N+1)^{N+1}(N-m)^{N-m}(N+1-m)}=\frac{q(N)}{q(N-m)}\leq 1.$$

Hence $p(m,N)\leq\lim_{\widetilde{N}\to\infty}p(m,\widetilde{N})=\mathrm{e}^m m!$ and therefore the left-hand side of (10) is bounded by $(\frac{m^m}{\mathrm{e}^m m!})^{1/2}$. Since the upper bound is decreasing in m, the assertion follows. □

Lemma 2.3 *Let $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $m\in\underline{n}_0=\{0,\dots,n\}$ and $w_{1,k},w_{2,k}\in\mathbb{C}$ for $k\in\underline{n}$. Then*

$$\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\,\prod_{k=1}^n(w_{1,k}+w_{2,k}y)\Big)\Big|\leq\binom{n}{m}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n|w_{2,k}|^2\Big)^{m/2}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n|w_{1,k}|^2\Big)^{(n-m)/2}. \tag{11}$$

Proof. Using Cauchy's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\,\prod_{k=1}^n(w_{1,k}+w_{2,k}y)\Big)\Big|=\Big|\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=m}\Big(\prod_{k\in K}w_{2,k}\Big)\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}w_{1,k}\Big|\\&\leq\Big(\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=m}\prod_{k\in K}|w_{2,k}|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=m}\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}|w_{1,k}|^2\Big)^{1/2}\\&=\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\,\prod_{k=1}^n(1+|w_{2,k}|^2y)\Big)^{1/2}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^{n-m};\,\prod_{k=1}^n(1+|w_{1,k}|^2y)\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (11) now follows from a result due to Maclaurin, which says that, if $g_0,\dots,g_n\in[0,\infty)$ then $\big(\frac{1}{\binom{n}{\ell}}\mathrm{Coeff}(y^\ell;\,\prod_{k=1}^n(1+g_ky))\big)^{1/\ell}$ is non-increasing in $\ell\in\underline{n}$, see Hardy *et. al* (1952), Theorem 52, page 52. □

Lemma 2.4 *Let $n,N\in\mathbb{N}$, $m\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ with $m\leq\min\{n,N\}$, $(a_{j,k})\in\mathbb{C}^{N\times n}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^N a_{j,k}=0$ for all $k\in\underline{n}$, $b\in\mathbb{C}^n$, $\alpha=\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{j=1}^N\sum_{k=1}^n|a_{j,k}|^2$, $\beta=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n|b_k|^2$. Then*

$$\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\,\Big(\sum_{k=1}^n b_kx_k\Big)^{n-m}\prod_{j=1}^N\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^n a_{j,k}x_k\Big)\Big)\Big|\leq\frac{m^{m/2}N^{N/2}(n-m)!}{(N-m)^{(N-m)/2}}\binom{n}{m}\alpha^{m/2}\beta^{(n-m)/2}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}|a_{j,k}|^2$, $(k\in\underline{n})$. Application of Lemma 2.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{(n-m)!}\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}b_kx_k\Big)^{n-m}\prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_{j,k}x_k\Big)\Big)\Big|\\
&=\Big|\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=n-m}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ \Big(\prod_{k\in K}(b_kx_k)\Big)\prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_{j,k}x_k\Big)\Big)\Big|\\
&=\Big|\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=n-m}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}x_k;\ \prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(1+\sum_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}a_{j,k}x_k\Big)\Big)\prod_{k\in K}b_k\Big|\\
&\leq\frac{m^{m/2}N^{N/2}}{(N-m)^{(N-m)/2}}\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}:\,|K|=n-m}\Big(\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}\sqrt{\alpha_k}\Big)\prod_{k\in K}|b_k|\\
&=\frac{m^{m/2}N^{N/2}}{(N-m)^{(N-m)/2}}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\ \prod_{k=1}^{n}(|b_k|+\sqrt{\alpha_k}y)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is easily completed using Lemma 2.3. □

We now present our first main result, which generalizes Theorem A. Indeed, it will turn out that $\gamma\leq\frac{n}{N}$ and, for $\ell=1$, $H_\ell(Z)=\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k$, see the Remarks 2.2 and 2.3 below. A further advantage of γ is that it can be equal to zero, that is in the case $z_{j,k}=\widetilde{z}_k$ for all $j\in\underline{N}$ and $k\in\underline{n}$. We note that the singularity in (12) can be removed, see Theorem 2.2 below.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $N\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\in\underline{N}$, $\ell\in\underline{n}$ and $Z=(z_{j,k})\in\mathbb{C}^{N\times n}$. For $j\in\underline{N}$ and $k\in\underline{n}$, we assume that $|z_{j,k}|\leq 1$ and set $\widetilde{z}_k=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}z_{j,k}$, $a_{j,k}=z_{j,k}-\widetilde{z}_k$, $U_j(x)=\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_{j,k}x_k$, where $x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ is an indeterminate. Further, let C_ℓ be as in Lemma 2.2 and*

$$\alpha=\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2,\quad \beta=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|\widetilde{z}_k|^2,\quad \gamma=\frac{n\alpha}{N}\min\Big\{n,\ \frac{1}{1-\beta}\Big\},$$

$$G_m(Z)=\frac{(N-m)!}{(n-m)!N!}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{N}(1+U_j(x))\Big)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big)\qquad \text{for } m\in\underline{n}_0,$$

$$H_\ell(Z)=\sum_{m=0}^{\ell}G_m(Z).$$

If $\gamma<\mathrm{e}^{-2}$, then

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big|\leq C_{\ell+1}\frac{(\mathrm{e}^2\gamma)^{(\ell+1)/2}}{\sqrt{1-\mathrm{e}^2\gamma}}.\tag{12}$$

Proof. Let $W_m(x)=\mathrm{Coeff}(y^m;\ \prod_{j=1}^{N}(1+U_j(x)y))$ for $m\in\underline{N}_0$. In view of (5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^{n}z_{j,k}x_k\Big)&=\prod_{j=1}^{N}\Big(U_j(x)+1+\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)=\sum_{m=0}^{N}W_m(x)\Big(1+\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)^{N-m}\\
&=\sum_{m=0}^{N}\sum_{r=0}^{N-m}\binom{N-m}{r}W_m(x)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)^{r},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$G_m(Z)=\frac{(N-m)!}{(n-m)!N!}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\,W_m(x)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big), \tag{13}$$

we see that

$$\mathrm{Per}(Z)=\sum_{m=0}^{n}\binom{N-m}{n-m}\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\,W_m(x)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_kx_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big)=\frac{N!}{(N-n)!}\sum_{m=0}^{n}G_m(Z)$$

and therefore $\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)=H_n(Z)$. Using Lemmas 2.4 and 2.2 and the simple inequality $\binom{n}{m}\leq\binom{N}{m}(\frac{n}{N})^m$ for $m\in\underline{n}_0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big|\leq\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n}|G_m(Z)|\\&\leq\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n}\frac{(N-m)!}{N!}\frac{m^{m/2}N^{N/2}}{(N-m)^{(N-m)/2}}\binom{n}{m}\alpha^{m/2}\beta^{(n-m)/2}\\&\leq C_{\ell+1}\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n}\frac{\mathrm{e}^m}{\binom{N}{m}^{1/2}}\binom{n}{m}\alpha^{m/2}\beta^{(n-m)/2}\\&\leq C_{\ell+1}\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n}(\mathrm{e}^2\gamma)^{m/2}\Big(\binom{n}{m}\max\Big\{1-\beta,\frac{1}{n}\Big\}^m\beta^{n-m}\Big)^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\beta\in[0,1]$. By applying Cauchy's inequality and the fact that, since $\ell\geq1$, $\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{n}\binom{n}{m}\frac{1}{n^m}\leq(1+\frac{1}{n})^n-2\leq\mathrm{e}-2\leq1$, the proof is completed. □

For the rest of the paper, let the notation of Theorem 2.1 hold.

Remark 2.2 We have $\gamma\leq\frac{n}{N}$, since

$$\alpha=\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|z_{j,k}|^2-\beta\leq1-\beta. \tag{14}$$

In particular, if $|z_{j,k}|=1$ for all $j\in\underline{N}$ and $k\in\underline{n}$, then $\alpha=1-\beta$. Indeed, writing $z_{j,k}=u_{j,k}+\mathrm{i}v_{j,k}$ and $\widetilde{z}_k=\widetilde{u}_k+\mathrm{i}\widetilde{v}_k$ with $u_{j,k},v_{j,k}\in\mathbb{R}$, $\widetilde{u}_k=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{j,k}$ and $\widetilde{v}_k=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}v_{j,k}$, we obtain

$$\alpha=\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{k=1}^{n}[(u_{j,k}-\widetilde{u}_k)^2+(v_{j,k}-\widetilde{v}_k)^2]=\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{N}[u_{j,k}^2+v_{j,k}^2]-N[\widetilde{u}_k^2+\widetilde{v}_k^2]\Big],$$

from which (14) follows.

Let us now collect some properties of the first $G_m(Z)$, where we always assume that $m\in\underline{n}_0$.

Remark 2.3 (a) The first $G_m(Z)$ can be evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&G_0(Z)=\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k,\quad G_1(Z)=0,\quad G_2(Z)=-\frac{(N-2)!}{N!}\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}\colon|K|=2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\prod_{k\in K}a_{j,k}\Big)\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}\widetilde{z}_k,\\&G_3(Z)=2\frac{(N-3)!}{N!}\sum_{K\subseteq\underline{n}\colon|K|=3}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\prod_{k\in K}a_{j,k}\Big)\prod_{k\in\underline{n}\setminus K}\widetilde{z}_k.\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

In order to prove this, let

$$V_m(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (-U_j(x))^m, \quad W_m(x) = \mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\ \prod_{j=1}^{N}(1+U_j(x)y)\Big)$$

for $m \in \underline{N}_0$. We have

$$W_m(x) = -\frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=0}^{m-2} W_k(x)V_{m-k}(x) \quad \text{for } m \in \underline{N},$$

which can be shown in the same way as (10) in Roos (2000). In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} &W_0(x) = 1, \quad W_1(x) = 0, \quad W_2(x) = -\frac{1}{2}V_2(x), \\ &W_3(x) = -\frac{1}{3}V_3(x), \quad W_4(x) = \frac{1}{8}(V_2(x))^2 - \frac{1}{4}V_4(x). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In view of (13), (16) and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ V_m(x)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k x_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big) \\ &= (-1)^m \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ (U_j(x))^m\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k x_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big) \\ &= (-1)^m (n-m)!\, m! \sum_{j=1}^{N}\ \sum_{K\subseteq \underline{n}:\, |K|=m} \Big(\prod_{k\in K} a_{j,k}\Big) \prod_{k\in \underline{n}\setminus K} \widetilde{z}_k, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for $m \in \underline{n}$, we see that (15) is true. We note that the representations in (15) of $G_2(Z)$ and $G_3(Z)$ have a simple form, but the omitted ones of $G_m(Z)$ with $m \geq 4$ are more complicated.

(b) Part (a) implies that $H_1(Z) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \widetilde{z}_k$ and, if $n \geq 2$,

$$H_2(Z) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \widetilde{z}_k - \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{K\subseteq \underline{n}:\, |K|=2} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\prod_{k\in K} a_{j,k}\Big) \prod_{k\in \underline{n}\setminus K} \widetilde{z}_k.$$

(c) From (17) and Lemma 2.3 it follows that, for $m \in \underline{n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(x_1\cdots x_n;\ V_m(x)\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k x_k\Big)^{n-m}\Big)\Big| \\ &\leq (n-m)!\, m! \sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big|\mathrm{Coeff}\Big(y^m;\ \prod_{k=1}^{n}(\widetilde{z}_k + a_{j,k}y)\Big)\Big| \leq n! \sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2\Big)^{m/2}\beta^{(n-m)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (15) gives

$$|G_2(Z)| \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2(N-1)}\alpha\beta^{(n-2)/2}, \quad |G_3(Z)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\frac{n!(N-3)!}{(n-3)!N!}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2\Big)^{3/2}\beta^{(n-3)/2}.$$

(d) The inequalities given in (c) can be used to derive bounds for $|G_2(Z)|$ and $|G_3(Z)|$ depending on γ. For precise calculations, we use the notation

$$\gamma(d)=\frac{n\alpha}{N}\min\Big\{dn,\,\frac{1}{1-\beta}\Big\}$$

for $d\in(0,\infty)$, giving $\gamma=\gamma(1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}|G_2(Z)| &\leq \gamma(1/2)\max\Big\{\beta^{(n-2)/2},\,\frac{1}{2}n(1-\beta)\beta^{(n-2)/2}\Big\}\frac{N(n-1)}{(N-1)n}\leq\gamma(1/2), &(18)\\ |G_3(Z)| &\leq \sqrt{3}\,\frac{(n-1)(n-2)N^2}{(N-1)(N-2)n^2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2\min\Big\{\frac{n}{3},\frac{1}{1-\beta}\Big\}\Big)^{3/2}\\ &\qquad\cdot\max\Big\{\beta^{(n-3)/2},\,\Big(\frac{n}{3}\Big)^{3/2}(1-\beta)^{3/2}\beta^{(n-3)/2}\Big\}\\ &\leq \sqrt{3}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2\min\Big\{\frac{n}{3},\frac{1}{1-\beta}\Big\}\Big)^{3/2}. &(19)\end{aligned}$$

We note that (19) implies that $|G_3(Z)|$ is bounded by $\sqrt{3}(\gamma(1/3))^{3/2}$, which is however of worse order.

The following result is a consequence of Theorem 2.1, (18) and (19).

Corollary 2.1 *If $\gamma<\mathrm{e}^{-2}$, then*

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{z}_k\Big|\leq\gamma(1/2)+C_3\,\frac{(\mathrm{e}^2\gamma)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-\mathrm{e}^2\gamma}},$$

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_2(Z)\Big|\leq\sqrt{3}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\Big(\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}|a_{j,k}|^2\min\Big\{\frac{n}{3},\frac{1}{1-\beta}\Big\}\Big)^{3/2}+C_4\,\frac{(\mathrm{e}^2\gamma)^2}{\sqrt{1-\mathrm{e}^2\gamma}},$$

where the second inequality requires $n\geq 2$.

We now show that the singularity in (12) can be removed.

Theorem 2.2 *For fixed $\ell\in\underline{n}$, let κ_ℓ be the smallest absolute constant such that, without any restrictions on γ,*

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big|\leq\kappa_\ell\,\gamma^{(\ell+1)/2}.$$

Then

$$\kappa_\ell\leq\frac{C_{\ell+1}\,\mathrm{e}^{\ell+1}}{\sqrt{1-x_\ell}},$$

where $x_\ell\in(0,1)$ is the unique positive solution of the equation

$$2+C_2x\Big(\frac{1-x^{\ell-1}}{1-x}\Big)^{1/2}=C_{\ell+1}\frac{x^{(\ell+1)/2}}{\sqrt{1-x}}. \qquad (20)$$

In particular, $\kappa_1\leq 15.72$, $\kappa_2\leq 52.83$ and $\kappa_3\leq 155.57$.

Proof. Dividing (20) by $x^{(\ell+1)/2}$ yields a decreasing left-hand side, whereas the right-hand side remains increasing in x. Therefore (20) has indeed a unique positive solution $x_\ell \in (0,1)$. Similary as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big| &\le \frac{(N-n)!}{N!}|\mathrm{Per}(Z)|+|H_\ell(Z)| \le 2+\sum_{m=2}^{\ell}|G_m(Z)|\\ &\le 2+C_2\sum_{m=2}^{\ell}(\mathrm{e}^2\gamma)^{m/2}\Big(\binom{n}{m}\max\Big\{1-\beta,\frac{1}{n}\Big\}^m\beta^{n-m}\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le 2+C_2\Big(\sum_{m=2}^{\ell}s^m\Big)^{1/2}=2+C_2 s\Big(\frac{1-s^{\ell-1}}{1-s}\Big)^{1/2}=:h(s),\end{aligned}$$

where $s=\mathrm{e}^2\gamma$. If $s\in[0,x_\ell]$, we obtain by Theorem 2.1 that

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big| \le \frac{C_{\ell+1}}{\sqrt{1-s}}s^{(\ell+1)/2} \le \frac{C_{\ell+1}\mathrm{e}^{\ell+1}}{\sqrt{1-x_\ell}}\gamma^{(\ell+1)/2}.$$

If $s\in(x_\ell,\infty)$, then

$$\Big|\frac{(N-n)!}{N!}\mathrm{Per}(Z)-H_\ell(Z)\Big| \le h(s) \le \frac{h(x_\ell)}{x_\ell^{(\ell+1)/2}}s^{(\ell+1)/2} = \frac{C_{\ell+1}\mathrm{e}^{\ell+1}}{\sqrt{1-x_\ell}}\gamma^{(\ell+1)/2}.$$

The proof is easily completed by using that $x_1\le 0.94019$, $x_2\le 0.967614$ and $x_3\le 0.975935$. $\square$

References

Bobkov, S.G. (2004). Concentration of normalized sums and a central limit theorem for noncorrelated random variables. *Ann. Probab.*, **32**, 2884–2907.

Bobkov, S.G. (2005). Generalized symmetric polynomials and an approximate de Finetti representation. *J. Theor. Probab.*, **18**, 399–412.

Carlen, E., Lieb, E.H., Loss, M. (2006). An inequality of Hadamard type for permanents. *Methods Appl. Anal.*, **13**, 1–17.

Cheon, G.-S., Wanless I.M. (2005). An update on Minc's survey of open problems involving permanents. Linear Alg. Appl., **403**, 314–342.

Diaconis, P., Freedman, D. (1980). Finite exchangeable sequences. *Ann. Probab.*, **8**, 745–764.

Hardy, G.H., Littlewood, J.E., Pólya, G. (1952). Inequalities. Second edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hewitt, E., Savage, L.J. (1955). Symmetric measures on cartesian products. Trans. Amer. Math Soc., **80**, 470–501.

Minc, H. (1978). Permanents. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Roos, B. (2000). Binomial approximation to the Poisson binomial distribution: The Krawtchouk expansion. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **45**, 258–272.

Roos, B. (2001). Multinomial and Krawtchouk approximations to the generalized multinomial distribution. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **46**, 103–117.